

F 786

.S79

Copy 1



Class F786

Book 579

OFFICIAL DONATION.

L.C.

STATEHOOD FOR THE TERRITORIES.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the following

PAPERS RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF STATEHOOD FOR THE TERRITORIES.

FEBRUARY 14, 1903.—Ordered to be printed.

ADDRESS OF HON. W. B. CHILDERS, RETIRING PRESIDENT OF THE NEW MEXICO BAR ASSOCIATION, AT THE SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL SESSION HELD AT SANTA FE, N. MEX., JANUARY 12, 1903.

NEW MEXICO BAR ASSOCIATION,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Santa Fe, N. Mex., January 13, 1903.

SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING.

I, the undersigned, Edward L. Bartlett, secretary of the above association, hereby certify that at an adjourned meeting of said association, held on the 12th day of January, 1903, Hon. William B. Childers, the retiring president of said association, in accordance with the by-laws, delivered his address as such president, which is in words and figures following, viz:

GENTLEMEN OF THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF NEW MEXICO: It has occurred to me that the most appropriate subject for discussion by this association at the present time is the measure pending in the Senate of the United States for the admission of our Territory into the union of States.

I regret, however, that the demands upon my time for the past few weeks have been so imperative as to prevent me from giving the subject the careful consideration and painstaking research its importance demands.

I believe that it is eminently proper that this association should assert itself on this subject, and make all the influence it has, felt in forming and directing public opinion in New Mexico, in Congress, and in the country at large. Indeed, I do not see how any intelligent citizen of New Mexico can help but take the keenest interest in this subject. If there has ever been a time in the history of the Territory when it was confronted with a crisis, it is now.

Whenever questions so vitally affecting the well-being of a people

OF CONGRESS

as the right of self-government, and representation in the supreme law-making power, have arisen, the bar, in all countries, either free or seeking to be free, has been foremost in the creation and direction of public opinion. Members of our profession have ever stood forth as the champions and advocates of the right of the people to govern themselves.

Recently the committee of the Senate of the United States visited our Territory, and, after spending five or six days in three or four localities, has made a report, publishing to the world the conclusions reached by them, not only that we are not entitled by right of fitness or public policy to become a State in the Union and govern ourselves under our own State constitution and to representation in the Congress of the United States, but that we never will be entitled, by reason of capacity, population, resources, or from the standpoint of public policy, to exercise such right.

This report means this, or it means nothing at all. This is a matter of easy demonstration from the report itself.

It is not my purpose to attempt a vindication of the people of New Mexico against the aspersions cast upon them by this report. We know that the report of the evidence pretended to have been taken before this committee is inaccurate, garbled, and misleading. Individuals who have been thus misrepresented may deny the accuracy and correctness of the pretended report of what they said before this committee. We, as a people, however, can not help feeling our utter helplessness when thus attacked by the report of a committee of a body usually so just, conservative, and august as the Senate of the United States. All we can do is to express our gratitude to those noble champions of the principles of popular rights and free government, who are, in the debate now in progress in the Senate of the United States, repelling the unjust assaults upon a people without their own chosen representatives to advocate their cause.

I especially desire to direct your attention to the new conditions proposed by this report for the admission of a Territory into the Union of States; conditions which I believe have no foundation in constitutional law, and are unsupported by historical precedent.

These conditions are not only novel, but, according to this report, will for all time be impossible of fulfillment by New Mexico. The report says:

Indeed, it would have been well, and would now be well, if the rule could be adopted, that any new State should have a population equal to the average population of the remainder of the States. This rule would require a population at the present time of 1,650,000, and, as has been stated, New Mexico's population is 195,310, and that of Arizona 122,931.

The report then deduces, from the alleged evidence as reported by the committee, and other data, the conclusion that New Mexico and Arizona will probably never have the requisite population. It proclaims to the world that the present inhabitants of Arizona and New Mexico are not only unfit for statehood, but that the resources of the Territories give no promise of ever sustaining a population entitling them to that right. I say right, because I believe it to be a right, founded, as our Government was formed, upon the immutable principles of free government.

Let us for a moment consider this proposition. If New Mexico is now denied admission because she has not this average population, she

never can hope for admission, for the reason that she can never hope to attain this average at the time of admission. The proposition is that the average "at the present time" is 1,650,000. What will it be five or ten years hence? To attain such an average she must far outstrip the States of the Union in growth and development. Such a proposition means "Bureaucratic" government, from Washington, for all time. The committee seems, however, to think this is a desirable form of government. The report says:

This compels consideration of a much-used argument, that the people of a Territory are deprived of self-government, and are entitled, as a right, to this great privilege. This argument is refuted by the fact that the people of the Territory enjoy practically all of the substance of self-government that the people of the States enjoy, save only the power of creating unlimited debt. It is easy to see how persons interested in enterprises for which they hope for aid from the people's pockets might want this restriction removed, but it is not easy to see what advantage it will be to the people themselves to have it removed.

Is it true that the people of a Territory enjoy practically all of the substance of self-government that is enjoyed by the people of a State? The governor, secretary, and judges in a Territory are appointed from Washington. For the past few years some, but not all, of them have been appointed from the residents of the Territory. It was the rule formerly, and in many instances still is in practice, to reward the protégé's supporters and followers of political chiefs with these appointments. But whether appointed from the Territories or from without, they are not responsible, nor amenable, to the people of the Territories. Public opinion in the Territories is not a factor. It can be compared to nothing in the nature of government so appropriately as to the proconsular government of a Roman province. If, justly or unjustly, these public servants are to be called to account for the administration of their offices, it is not before the bar of public opinion of any people that they are to be arraigned. Charges are made to a department in Washington, justly or unjustly, and upon such charge—ex parte affidavits, crimination and recrimination—the tenure of the official often depends.

Under such a system there can be no healthy public opinion. Under such a system official responsibility and integrity can never be what a free people should demand. Under it it is difficult for the public official to have that sense of independence and responsibility so necessary to a proper discharge of his duties. Under such a system the support of public opinion for the public servant, so necessary in free government, is wanting.

In many instances the support of powerful political friends has sufficed to protect the guilty, and the want of such support has worked the condemnation of the innocent. Would the people of Indiana call this "enjoying practically all of the substance of self-government?"

In what I have said I do not mean to reflect upon any particular present or past incumbent of a Territorial office. It is the system I am discussing. I have failed to find any justification, even in the evidence reported by the committee, for what is said in the foregoing extract with reference to the removal of restrictions upon contracting public debts in aid of public enterprises. All of us know well that any such attempt in New Mexico would meet with no success. I do not doubt that any constitution drafted and submitted to the people of New Mexico would contain more drastic restrictions than the present act of Congress known as the "Harrison Act."

The final conclusion of the committee is as follows:

So that upon the question of self-government the whole matter is narrowed down to a voting representation in Congress, and thus affects the people of the Territory only as it has to do with the shaping of the various policies of the entire nation, and thus this argument is reduced to the crux of the whole matter, to wit: The requisites entitling a body of territory to a participation in the formation of great national policies.

Is this true in principles, or in fact? Could not the same objection have been made to the admission of Vermont, with its 45,000 people, and to every State since? We need representation in Congress to protect our local interests far more than old States needed it. The interests of the old States are bound up in the results of national policies, except as to a few appropriations. We know how difficult it has been to protect ourselves against spoliation by national legislation in the past few years.

National politics subserve the interests of the old States far more than they do ours. Representation is necessary to New Mexico to protect our Territory against spoliation. It took Congress forty years to enact a law to pass upon Mexican and Spanish titles in New Mexico. It passed a law to settle those titles in California in less than three years after her admission into the Union. This committee claims that we have not increased the diversion of water from our streams since the cession of New Mexico to the United States. At this very time a bill is pending in Congress making it a crime to divert any more water from the Rio Grande. The people of the Territory have for several years felt it necessary to send at their own expense delegations to Washington to beg and plead for protection against the deprivation of their natural rights.

The answer of the committee to the demands of New Mexico does not differ in principle or logic from the answer of Lord North and George the Third to Massachusetts and Virginia when they refused to submit to taxation without representation. Is the right to full citizenship, to the exercise of every right and privilege, a mere sentimentality? Has it no higher value in the opinion of the majority of the United States Senate? Is the immortal declaration "that all just government rests upon the consent of the governed" the mere mousing of a phrase maker? To hold a Territory in a state of perpetual or even protracted tutelage results in nothing but a condition of arrested development. This report is probably the first time that the principle of local self-government as a factor in American institutions—illustrated as it is by almost every governing body of the Union, from a New England town meeting to the chief executive and legislature of a State—has been so contemptuously appraised by American statesmen.

It is difficult to understand how American statesmen can proclaim to the world that the ambition of the people to have a voice in the formation of national policies that may mean weal or woe to them should fall upon deaf ears.

The people of the Territories have not the wealth of the great States in the Union, but their stake in the result of national policies is not for that reason any less. "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," our forefathers declared, were the purposes to be subserved by all government. Are these principles of less value to the people of New Mexico than they were to Virginia and Massachusetts in 1776? If we show ourselves indifferent to these great fundamental principles

of free government, we simply confirm the report of this committee as to our capacity to govern ourselves.

The proposition submitted by the committee is in effect that the people of the Territories are indifferent as to statehood and the results to be attained by its acquisition. If history does not belie itself, the same answer in effect was given to the demands of the American people in 1775 and 1776. If we are not grievously mistaken, the opponents of the American colonies then contended that the patriots and statesmen who championed free government were mere politicians seeking place and personal preferment. We must, too, recall the fact that the Tories of that day, in every particular, occupied the same position now taken by a few people in New Mexico with reference to this statehood movement. Such people, in all times and all countries, belong to the so-called well-to-do or rich classes—sometimes euphemistically designated as the conservative business men.

The fear that any change might injuriously affect their own narrow, personal business interests dominates and controls their judgment and opinions. I do not believe this class is large in New Mexico. Most of our business men are broad minded, active, and progressive, and recognize the fact that their interests, business and personal, are in common with the whole people of the Territory.

We are led to consider whether the position taken by the Senate committee is not at war with the fundamental principles ingrafted in the Constitution of the United States. This conclusion, it seems to me, can not be escaped. We have but to refer to the debates of 1787 to learn that United States Senators neither represent "areas or population;" they represent States, not communities. All through the debates in that convention the House of Representatives was designated as the first body, and the Senate the second body. It is true that the result reached by the convention was in a sense a compromise—an absolutely necessary one, however. But the States voted in the convention as States. When the roll was called the States answered, not their representatives. The States were then as indestructible as the Union is now. The plan of making all measures for taxation and expenditure of public moneys originate in the House as a representative of all the people was formulated by Dr. Franklin after protracted debate in the convention and adopted substantially as formulated by him.^a The subject of the admission of new States, after protracted and earnest debate and submission of several different reports by the committee, as it appears in the Constitution was proposed by Gouverneur Morris. It may be interesting to call attention to the fact in this connection that the only change made in the provision as first proposed was as to the requirement that a two-thirds vote in Congress should be necessary. This was amended so that only a majority vote is required for the passage of an act admitting a State into the Union, as in the case of any other measure.^b This provision in the Constitution was carried by the vote of eight States, the only States voting against it being the comparatively small States, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland.

In the spirit of the Constitution, can the representatives of Vermont

^aSee Journal of Constitutional Convention, 1787, vol. 1, pages 278 and 279, Scot's edition. The report of the committee subsequently made and adopted, id., 637; id., 638.

^bId., vol. 2, page 460.

and Massachusetts deny all citizens born under the American flag full equality with every other American citizen because they do not like their language and because the people of the Territory do not forswear their mother tongue, or because they do not like their religion? We are compelled to say that Congress has the power so to do, but not the constitutional nor the moral right. The report of the committee, as we think we have shown, proposes to adopt this policy—to make it a principle in American constitutional law. I read from a recent author on this subject, as follows:

The question has arisen whether Congress can upon any other ground than lack of a republican form of government refuse admission to a State formed out of a Territory of the United States.

That it may do so, practically, is undoubted, but can it be justified in keeping a Territory without representation and subject to the authority of the Government, unless upon grounds which the Constitution makes an objection to its admission? We have seen that the decisions have been uniform that a State admitted to the Union stands in its relation to the Government of the Union in no respect different from that which obtains between the old and original States. (Tucker on the Constitution, p. 614.)

While considering this subject the fact at once forces itself upon us that in the Dominion of Canada there are communities and provinces where the French language has been spoken for more than one hundred and fifty years, and during all of that period of time these people have been British subjects and an integral part of the British Empire, and no British statesman has ever dared to suggest that their rights should be abridged because they could not speak the English language. Nor is it necessary, in order to make a freeman out of a man, that he speak any particular language. This is equally true in the case of Louisiana.

The committee has seen fit to object to the use of interpreters in the courts of New Mexico. They are used in many different localities in the United States. They are not used to the extent that the committee has claimed that they are in New Mexico. In many of the counties they are not used at all. As all of us know, there are no records kept in the district courts of the Territory of New Mexico in any other language than English, yet the report would seem to carry the impression that all the court proceedings were in the Spanish language. It has been more than twenty years since any man has been permitted to address the jury in the district courts of New Mexico in Spanish.

If Congress should sustain the position of the committee denying to the people of New Mexico the rights which legitimately belong to them by treaty pledges under the general principles of American constitutional law, the only resource that is left to us is to appeal to the conscience of the people of the United States. One of the greatest of the old original abolitionists defined agitation as an appeal to the conscience of a nation, outside of its laws. If we are denied what every free citizen who thinks must recognize as our right, this is the only remedy left us.

Space does not permit discussion of the obligations resting upon the people of the United States as the result of a solemn treaty made with Mexico, or the want of good faith toward American citizens other than of Spanish blood who have settled in New Mexico upon the plighted faith of their country and never for one moment believed that this faith could be treated as a matter of so little moment.

In conclusion, we are confronted with the proposition to admit New Mexico and Arizona as one State. There may be some reluctance to

accept this compromise, but it would certainly be wiser to do so than to have both Territories left as they are. It would not be difficult to adopt a constitution and enact a system of laws satisfactory to the people of both Territories; and until such time as the legislature could adopt a general code and system of laws applicable to both Territories, the present laws might be left in force as applicable only to the Territorial area over which they are now in force. The biennial sessions of the legislature might for a time, for the convenience of the people of the two Territories, be held alternately in New Mexico and Arizona. The sessions of the supreme court might be held in the same way. Indeed, it is not difficult to see that, with the present means of communication, State government could be administered over a State composed of both New Mexico and Arizona quite as conveniently as in the States of California and Texas; and it is apparent, too, that the advantages arising from the admission of the two States into the Union, and according to them proper representation in Congress, would more than compensate for any inconvenience which they might temporarily suffer from union not sought by them but accepted merely as a matter of necessity.

I regret that space does not permit me to discuss many of the questions upon which I have barely touched more at length. I am, however, earnestly of the opinion that this association should give some formal expression to its views upon these measures now pending in Congress.

W. B. CHILDERS, *President*.

And that at the conclusion of the reading such address, upon motion, was adopted as the sentiment of this association, the same was ordered to be printed in the minutes, and copies thereof to be printed in pamphlet form and sent by the secretary to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, to the Attorney-General of the United States, to our Delegate in Congress, and to each Senator of the United States.

In witness whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the official seal of said association this the 13th day of January, A. D. 1903.

[SEAL]

EDWARD L. BARTLETT, *Secretary*.

NEW MEXICO'S CLAIMS—EX-GOVERNOR PRINCE PLEADS FOR STATEHOOD.

To the Editor of the Tribune.

SIR: In January, 1889, the Tribune published a letter from me headed "Admission of New Mexico: Both justice and expediency demand it," which was intended to correct gross misstatements made in Congress and in a portion of the press. It is strange that after fourteen years the same ignorance and prejudice should exist and call for the same kind of correction.

Yet these fourteen years have seen great progress and improvement in all material respects. In 1889 I wrote you, "No Territory ever had such thorough preparation for statehood." That was true then, and it is far more true now.

As early as 1850 the people of New Mexico, relying on the pledges of our Government, held a convention, adopted a constitution, elected

State officers, a legislature, and W. S. Messervy as member of Congress. In July the legislature elected R. H. Weightman and F. C. Cunningham as Senators, and they, with the member of Congress, proceeded to Washington. While on the journey they were met by the intelligence of the passage, on September 9, of the famous "compromise measure" which admitted California as a State and relegated New Mexico to the condition of a Territory. From that time to the present attempts to secure admission have constantly been made, and Congress has not entirely failed to respond to these appeals. In 1874-75 both Houses of the Forty-third Congress passed an enabling act, the House by a vote of 160 to 54 and the Senate by 32 to 11. The bill was slightly amended in the Senate and failed because it was impossible at the end of the session to bring it up for concurrence in the House. In the succeeding Congress a similar bill passed the Senate by a vote of 35 to 15, was reported favorably in the House, but failed to be reached. For twenty years scarcely a Congress has met in which an enabling act has not been passed in one House or the other; but by some accident or obstacle concurrent action has failed. If it was proper to admit New Mexico in 1874, before it possessed a mile of railroad, a single public building, a developed mine, a matured orchard, or an alfalfa field, what reason can now be given for delay, when its population has greatly increased, its condition vastly improved, and its resources of all kinds are being developed into sources of wealth?

In the pending discussion in Congress and in most articles in the press the really great principle involved seems to be lost sight of or ignored; that is, the right of self-government. This is the fundamental principle of republican institutions; it is the inherent right of the American citizen. It is our best heritage from our fathers. It is enough to make our New England Revolutionary ancestors turn in their graves to see their descendants deprived of these rights and held in bondage, and that by the votes of New England Senators. I confess it makes my Revolutionary blood hot with indignation to find that the latest naturalized foreigner in Colorado or Texas has all the rights of American citizenship and that, because I choose to cross an imaginary boundary line, I am deprived of the dearest of American rights, that of self-government.

A Territory has not a republican government, it is simply a province; its people are not citizens, they are subjects. If it has bad officials, there is no remedy, for they are not responsible to the people nor answerable to public opinion. If they have influence in Washington, they can violate law and override justice with impunity. As a temporary expedient, when the population is sparse and poor and can not sustain local government, the Territorial condition is a necessary evil; but it is exceptional and temporary, and as soon as the people are able to become self-governing they are entitled to that right. Every moment of delay after that time is an outrage on their Americanism.

I desire briefly to state a few facts to show not only that New Mexico has long passed that exceptional period, but that, as above stated, it is better prepared for statehood than any of the Territories heretofore admitted.

Population.—No Territory at the time of its admission, with the exception of Dakota and Utah, contained the population now in New Mexico. By the census of 1900 it had 195,310 inhabitants, without counting the Indians on the reservations. The real population, as has

been conclusively shown in public documents, was about 225,000. But taking the census figures, the above statement is correct. I must not occupy space with the full list of the populations of Territories at the times of their admission, but, as examples, Tennessee, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois each had about 50,000 inhabitants. If we take the preceding census, as we are doing with New Mexico, Indiana had only 24,530, and Illinois 12,282. So it is evident that there is now no reason on account of lack of population for depriving the people of New Mexico of their rights as citizens. On the contrary, it has more population than the old State of Delaware, 50,000 more than Idaho, more than double that of Wyoming, and five times that of Nevada.

If we consider the matter of natural resources and actual taxable valuation, we find that in the latter she far exceeds many other new States, and as to the variety and extent of resources no State approaches her except California and Colorado, and her vast treasure of coal gives her the advantage even over those favored regions.

The character of the population seems to be a bugbear to the unfriendly Senators who recently became familiar with the Territory, which is much larger than New England and New York combined, in three days. Facts, however, should carry more weight than prejudices or unfounded slanders.

The people are loyal. During the rebellion, out of a total population of 93,567, she sent 6,561 into the Army, a larger percentage than any Eastern State; and the victory at Glorieta saved the Pacific slope to the Union. In the recent Spanish war no less than 1,089 volunteers enlisted, including about 500 of the Rough Riders, who gained renown and made a President at San Juan Hill.

They are American. The foreign element is smaller in New Mexico than anywhere else in the country except some parts of the South. Only $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the population is foreign born. Idaho has 21, Wyoming 24, Washington 25, Montana 43, North Dakota 45. Even in the older States, New York and Michigan have 26, Massachusetts 29, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, and California 30, and Minnesota 36 per cent.

They are public spirited. Without the slightest aid from the National Government they have built a beautiful capitol, a substantial penitentiary, an insane asylum, university and agricultural college, school of mines, normal university, normal school, military institute, and blind asylum, and when the capitol was destroyed by fire they erected another, which is the object of general admiration. Besides these Territorial institutions they have erected a multitude of county and city buildings.

But to the uninformed the large number of citizens of Spanish descent is looked upon as a grave misfortune. There could not be a greater mistake. It is the possession of that conservative element in connection with the enterprising American from the East which gives New Mexico her special advantages as a self-governing community. Everyone familiar with the far West knows that the principal danger in new sections arises from the unsettled character of much of the population. They are always looking for some new place to which to migrate. They are ready to vote for any amount of bonds and taxation, and to their irresponsible action is principally due the heavy indebtedness of so many western counties. The chief danger in many a new community comes from this class of men, and from the over-

enthusiasm of others, who think that life in the West is a continual boom. But New Mexico runs no such risk. She has a stable and conservative element in her native population, which counteracts the danger. They are attached to the soil and have no thought of leaving. They are naturally opposed to rash schemes which involve extravagant expense. Mixed with the zealous American they form an admirable combination.

Another objection raised against us is illiteracy. Some years ago there may have been force in this argument, but it has disappeared. In no respect has New Mexico made such rapid progress as in public education. Even under the crude system which existed before the public-school law of 1901, the census showed that while the population of the Territory increased 28 per cent during the decade from 1880 to 1890, the number of children enrolled in the schools increased 283 per cent, or ten times as rapidly. During the last decade the gain has been equally gratifying. The school law of 1891 gave a great impetus to public instruction, and the system is now very satisfactory. The total enrollment of scholars last year was 42,925. In this connection I wish to state a fact which may be a surprise, that New Mexico, with less than 250,000 people, now supports more public institutions of college grade than any State east of the Alleghanies. She has the university, agricultural college, normal university, school of mines, and military institute. All these have handsome buildings and are creditably administered. Where is any other community of similar population doing as much for higher education?

Thus it will be seen that in every essential particular New Mexico has long passed the period when a Territorial government was necessary or justifiable. But for partisanship and prejudice it would have been admitted long ago.

The right of self-government ought not to depend on the political views of the people interested or on party prejudices or exigencies. Yet we know that in practice these things do influence the admission of States, and no one has yet forgotten the long-continued injustice to Dakota because she was strongly Republican. But if these questions of political policy have to be considered there is every reason for Republican Senators to favor New Mexico. With the possible exception of Vermont and Pennsylvania, no State in the Union is as solidly and reliably Republican as New Mexico. Even the unjust treatment she has received in Washington can not change her allegiance. As long as the tariff is the prominent political issue she can not be driven out of the party, for all her great products, such as wool, cattle, lead, coal, and timber, are benefited by protection. From a party point of view New Mexico will be an assured acquisition for at least a generation.

One word with regard to the name "New Mexico," which seems to be a bugbear to some Eastern minds. All kinds of propositions are made for a change, a favorite suggestion being Montezuma, for no conceivable reason, as there is not the slightest connection between the unfortunate Aztec sovereign and this section of country. On the other hand, "New Mexico" is an old historic name. Only one American State, Florida, has a name more ancient. It was first used in 1581 by Espejo, more than a quarter of a century before Jamestown, New Amsterdam, or Plymouth were thought of. On all the ancient maps it appears as the "Kingdom of New Mexico," extending from Florida on

the east to the Pacific on the west. It would be vandalism to change a name so full of historic associations and which has endured for more than three centuries.

In every respect in which she controls her own destiny, New Mexico is improving and advancing. Her railroad development last year exceeded that of the whole Atlantic seaboard. The only obstacle is the continued Territorial condition. That affects both immigration and financial development. Statehood will bring good government and rapid improvement. The people will feel that they are really American citizens and not aliens or servants. All this will enkindle ambition, stimulate enterprise, and lead on to a glorious future.

L. BRADFORD PRINCE.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *January 6, 1903.*

[The Omaha World-Herald, Friday, January 23, 1903.]

ADMIT THE TERRITORIES.

The admission of Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Indian Territory at this session of Congress would be an act of simple justice. Besides, it would make the mainland a solid body of States, a matter of pride to every patriotic American. The spirit of our institutions is, that as soon as a Territory becomes sufficiently populated and self-supporting it should be admitted into the Union on an equality with the other States. Such was the purpose when Jefferson purchased the Louisiana territory, and when we acquired territory from Mexico. Yet for more than forty years New Mexico has been deprived of the rights of statehood, first upon one pretext and then another. The latest is because of the prevalence of the Spanish language. And right here, it is well to say, the question of language cut no figure in the admission of Louisiana, Missouri, and other States where the French language was prevalent.

Again, it is the charge of illiteracy. The facts are that in 1900, according to the Twelfth Census, the school enrollment of New Mexico was 17.61 per cent of the population; New Jersey, 17.40 per cent; New York, 16.77 per cent; Connecticut, 16.68 per cent; Massachusetts, 16.39 per cent, and Rhode Island, 15.63 per cent. Oklahoma's school enrollment was 15.01 per cent. With more than twice the population of New Mexico, the State of Senator Aldrich had an average daily school attendance of 49,038, and New Mexico 23,412.

Rhode Island had 1,960 teachers, or 1 teacher to 25 scholars, and New Mexico 1,046 teachers, or 1 teacher to 22 scholars. In Delaware the proportion is 1 teacher to 31 scholars, the same as in Georgia. In Wyoming it is 1 teacher to 17 scholars; in Nebraska, 1 to 19, and 1 to 14 in Iowa.

Taking Nebraska, Iowa, and Wyoming as the most intelligent States, the educational methods of New Mexico hold a favorable position to the brightest standard, while those of Rhode Island and other Atlantic coast States do not. Still the West with its superior intelligence, having the votes to change it, is continually called upon to bow to a dominating minority of Eastern States, and, strangest of all, certain Western Senators and Representatives in Congress wear the collar without shame.

As to population, 80 per cent of the population of these four Territories is native white; 5 per cent is foreign white, and 15 per cent is colored; but with the exception of the Indian Territory Massachusetts has a larger number of the colored races than any of the other three Territories.

In New England 73 per cent of the population is native white and 26 per cent foreign. The foreigners in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut outnumber the total population of the four Territories. So, also, in New York. In New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania, there are 3,302,116 foreign and 11,808,746 native whites. The colored races number 343,816. This is equivalent to a percentage of 77 per cent native white, 22 per cent foreign white, and about 2 per cent colored.

In the four Territories in 1901 there were 5,880 miles of railway mileage. Of these Arizona and New Mexico had 3,312 and Oklahoma and Indian Territory 2,548 miles. Arizona had more miles of railway than New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Delaware, or Maryland. So did New Mexico and the Indian Territory.

In live-stock values the four Territories in 1900 had \$141,766,178; the six New England States, \$70,634,088; New York, \$120,673,101; New Jersey and Pennsylvania combined, \$113,693,667; Ohio, \$120,466,134; Indiana, \$105,048,528, and five Southern States on the Atlantic coast \$140,877,455.

Oklahoma and New Mexico live-stock values exceeded those of New England by nearly \$15,000,000, about seven times greater than that of Rhode Island, and \$1,000,000 more than Massachusetts.

The value of crop products in the four Territories in 1900 was \$90,272,058. The Indian Territory and Connecticut product were nearly equal. Oklahoma was \$45,447,746, which was larger than any one of the New England States, Maryland, or New Jersey. Arizona exceeded Rhode Island and New Mexico exceeded Delaware, yet with a smaller population than New Mexico Delaware has the privilege of having United States Senators.

With a total population in 1900 of 1,108,632 these four Territories had no Senators. With a total population of 613,291 Delaware and Rhode Island had four members of the United States Senate and three Representatives in the House. The four Territories had one Delegate each. Is this fair?

With an excess of 495,341 over the population of Rhode Island and Delaware, these great Territories were members of the "voiceless" in the halls of Congress, and with unrepresented agricultural wealth amounting to more than \$450,000,000, while these two small States, having a smaller population, controlling an agricultural wealth of \$83,300,000, were favored with four Senators and three Representatives with the same power and privileges as New York, Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska, and others of the larger commonwealths.

GLOWING TRIBUTE TO NEW MEXICO.

The Boston Journal of Education, the leading educational periodical of the United States, the editor of which, Dr. A. E. Winship, was here in attendance upon the educational conventions of Christmas week, has

the following editorial utterance in its issue of January 22. This can not but be of immense benefit to New Mexico, as the Journal of Education circulates among the better class of teachers throughout the entire Union. Dr. Winship says:

"Those who are making a single trip through our new West, or have never seen it, merely read descriptions, can never feel the growth of the United States. There are hundreds of educational people who could have gone to Las Vegas and addressed a large audience, could have met the corps of admirable men and women teachers, could have looked over the plant of the normal university, and pronounced it one of the best normal school plants of its size in the United States, who could have felt the significance of it all as I did. I know but one with whom it would have been possible.

"Twenty years ago I became fairly well acquainted with all the leading cities and towns in the Territory, and every two or three years I kept up the acquaintance until 1890, since which time I have only been through the Territory incidentally. When I knew the Territory there was not a free public school, not a college or university. The Catholic Church had several schools, and during the ten years that I knew it other churches did about as much all told as the Catholics until some 4,000 children, largely of the English-speaking Americans, were in some private or church school. With this as a background I could feel as well as know what it meant to address the annual meeting of the teachers' association, representing more than 1,000 public school teachers, to whom more than \$600,000 is annually paid from the Territorial treasury in salaries for teaching more than 43,000 pupils.

"Eleven years ago not a public school of any kind, and to-day public kindergartens in several cities, public manual training schools, a normal school at Silver City, a normal university at Las Vegas, a school of mines at Socorro, an agricultural college at Mesilla Park, and a university at Albuquerque, with a total enrollment of 1,000 in the higher institutions.

"Ten years ago English was an unknown tongue over most of the area of New Mexico, whereas to-day it is taught the children of every county.

"The annual meeting of the teachers of New Mexico was held in the latest established of the public institutions, the Normal University of Las Vegas, an institution that was merely a theory or a hope five years ago, but to-day has a beautiful and well-appointed building and a faculty of experts. Despite its youth, it is one of the best normal schools in the country, and in the natural sciences, especially, I have never seen it excelled. In ethnology and entomology it is not approached in the whole country, and the art department is superior."

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 017 055 297 0